FEH
FORUM ESPACE HUMANITAIRE
3-5 Octobre 2019, Centre des Pensières, Annecy

2009-2019: 10 years of FEH
A decade of humanitarian aid, lessons learned and prospects

With the support of:

Fondation de France
Fondation Mérieux

And the contribution of:

ACTED, Action contre la Faim, Bioport, Care, Croix-Rouge française, Fondation Croix-Rouge française, Handicap International, Médecins du Monde, Oxfam, Première Urgence Internationale, Secours Islamique France, Solidarités International, SOS Village d'enfants

Organising Committee:
Anne Héry, Benoît Miribel, Philippe Ryfman, Virginie Troit

Operational Coordination:
Karl Blanchet, Wolf Eberwein, Boris Martin, Bernard Michel, Jean-Baptiste Richardier, Audrey Sala

The Forum Espace Humanitaire is an event held every 18 months, created to give the leaders of French international humanitarian organisations an occasion to come together to reflect and exchange ideas.

Following the success of the initial collaborative work with *Humanitarian Alternatives* (*HA*) in 2018, the founding members of the Forum Espace Humanitaire (FEH), Jean-François Mattei, Benoît Miribel and Philippe Ryfman, the Mérieux Foundation, and the executive committee of *HA* began discussions to transfer the organisation of the FEH from the Mérieux Foundation to *Humanitarian Alternatives*.

The FEH's 8th edition, marking the commemoration of its ten years of existence, was held at *Les Pensières Conference Centre* in Annecy from Thursday October 3 to Saturday October 5, 2019, on the theme:

"2009-2019: 10 years of FEH, a decade of humanitarian aid, lessons learned and prospects"

This event received support from the **Fondation de France** and **Fondation Mérieux** and the contribution of:

ACTED, Action contre la Faim, Bioport, Care, Croix-Rouge française, Fondation Croix-Rouge française, Handicap International, Médecins du Monde, Oxfam, Première Urgence Inter- nationale, Secours Islamique France, Solidarités International, SOS Village d'enfants.

This summary report of the discussions was prepared by Audrey Sala, in charge of coordination and communication at *Humanitarian Alternatives* and member of the FEH Operational Coordination Committee. The document was translated into English by Alan Johnson. This report has been validated by the Organising Committee in accordance with the principal of confidentiality (whereby speakers are neither specifically cited nor identified), known as Chatham House rules.

This report is not intended to be an exhaustive synthesis of the FEH's three days of enriching and profound discussions, debates, and interchanges. Its author's main intention, with the agreement of the Organising Committee, has been to present the most salient points brought up at the round tables, workshops, interventions, and plenary sessions.

For the first time since its creation, the FEH organised one day "extramurally" at the **International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)** in Geneva with whom the full day of debates and discussions were planned together. We would like to thank the ICRC in Geneva and the ICRC delegation in Paris for having hosted us to make this FEH possible.

Contents

NEUTRAL, IMPARTIAL, AND INDEPENDENT LOOKING TOWARDS 2030?

Since 2009 the humanitarian sector has undergone a profound metamorphosis. Stricken by unanticipated events and crises (Haiti, the Philippines, the Arab spring, the Syrian crisis, South Sudan, etc.), and by the on-going problems of migration and epidemics (e.g. Ebola in urban settings), the humanitarian sector has experienced turmoil in the likes of sexual abuse scandals and the refusal of relief in certain disasters. "Traditional" categories and definitions have become obsolete, such as those delineating boundaries between war and peace, or distinguishing emergency interventions from relief operations in chronic crises, the concept of North vs South, or interventions in emerging countries. The World Humanitarian Summit with its recommendations for localisation and the Grand Bargain have prompted new approaches. Over the past few months, the climate change agenda has become a hot topic in speeches that address the difficult question of how we are going to tackle the problematic issue of climate change.

In 2018 the *Global Humanitarian Assistance Report* has estimated the humanitarian sector's worth at 27 billion US$. As resources do not appear to be the problem, the widening gap between needs and funding is. As for the calls for funding reported by the United Nations, 72% of requests were honoured in 2009 and only 59% in 2018. This calls into question the system and its ability to reinvent itself.

Striking developments in the 2009-2019 decade

Over the past ten years we have seen an extremely large number of gross violations of international humanitarian law (IHL) and humanitarian principles. Ten years ago, we would have highlighted the humanitarian sector's achievements, e.g. the creation of the ICC, or the demands that those having committed major crimes and war crimes be rendered accountable. Today, the growing number of attacks against medical personnel and medical infrastructures do not necessarily elicit a strong and coordinated response from States. The contexts of our intervention are becoming increasingly complex, particularly in terms of security, as well as during crises, such as the DRC's Ebola epidemic, which involved multiple aspects (poverty, healthcare issues, conflicts). Our operational context is worrisome, but positive developments are emerging, not only in terms of aid delivered, but to whom it is delivered. Collectively, we are now better able to take into account the specific needs of men, women, children, the elderly, and people with disabilities than ten years ago.

Over the past decade, Haiti has been the worst example for lack of coordination. We need to better coordinate our humanitarian efforts. We must work on the basis of multi-needs assessments to arrive at a better consensus, to organise humanitarian relief in such way that all needs are covered. One of the main challenges in the coming years will be decision-making at the multilateral level in a system that is however fragmenting and now seeing the development of new nationalist movements. Humanitarian principles are far from being undisputed. Yet are they still valid? The grip is tightening. How can this development be stopped? How can the decay of standards and the restriction of humanitarian space be avoided? Should we continue to be the standard-bearers of humanitarian principles? Are local organisations capable of being truly neutral, independent, and impartial? When humanitarian policies are believed to be politically endorsed, how can we continue to provide relief that is impartial, neutral, and independent?

Problems of access and acceptance sometimes do not involve neutrality, independence, or impartiality, but rather quality of services provided (e.g. during the DRC Ebola crisis). Our work depends on our capacity to negotiate and overcome barriers. The world is changing. We must consider the stances adopt to gain greater room for manoeuvre and to base our actions on the ability for countries and populations to fend for themselves. This is the very rationale behind localisation, but whatever may be their position on this matter, NGOs must try to support this capacity transfer.

We must also understand that humanitarians cannot act alone. We must maintain connected not only with those involved in development but also in peacekeeping. We must be tightly focused on the challenge of sustaining the actions that help populations and communities become more resilient. Managers of the regional communities where we operate develop expertise. They have been educated through the development of university and online programmes, and coursework leading to diplomas. Over the last ten years, we have observed a model for approaching communities that gets them to become more greatly involved in our work and in the discussions on how we generate our actions.

How do environmental disasters put the aid system into question? In our intervention models that rely on energy and new technologies, is the structure of aid sustainable, and is it "fit for purpose"? Should we recognise environmental disasters as humanitarian disasters? Unprecedented challenges are multiplying, in addition to those of urbanisation, the lack of adequate social and healthcare resources for the world's population, and of mental health issues. How will our societies respond to internal displacements and international migration? The problem of global warming in the South is also directly impacting us. People migrate. As humanitarian actors, we must demand more from our partners (operational, financial, etc.) on this issue. We must ask what neutrality means in relation to the climate crisis and to the matter of social inclusion or exclusion.

Morally and ethically, what are acceptable sources of institutional funding? What are the resulting issues to be resolved to assure the sustainability of our actions, to uphold our inspiring humanitarian principles (e.g. for aid funding in Yemen)? New sources of funding are emerging, contributions from the private sector are increasing, but institutional funding is declining. What new kinds of funding can we contemplate? We must remain lucid and modest about what we can actually achieve.

How to respond to these challenges?

- Take a more local approach; be more on site where we are needed the most. Decide on an open approach that involves communities in the governance of our NGOs, so that they can participate in the design and implementation of our programmes, and thus in decision-making power. Also bring together research institutions and research networks that challenge us and help us respond effectively to our needs.

- Keep promoting volunteer work. We are seeing a greater number of volunteers, so how should we adapt to this?

- Be more accountable to people, to our donors, to each of one of us individually and as a network. Our primary humanitarian accountability must be centred around the people receiving aid. As for accountability and innovation, how can we manage these two points given the constraints to which organisations are subject? How can we jointly construct accountability with respect to the reality of what we do?

- Work through networks and strengthen our mutual capabilities.

- Exert an impact on humanitarian action and improve multi-sector needs assessments. Identify needs and define ways to meet them collectively.

- Digital transformation: determine how to better communicate with each other and not harm those we wish to serve.

- Become more innovative in terms of transformation and pursue an anthropological and scientific approach in the field. How can we keep providing sufficient resources, space, and time for innovation when we are under constant pressure to produce results and be operational? How can the rigorousness of procedures and bureaucracy be overcome?

« À CŒUR OUVERT » - STRAIGHT TALKING INTERVIEW WITH ÉRIC CHEVALLIER

This session began with a discussion with Éric Chevallier, Director of the Crisis and Support Centre, Minister Plenipotentiary. In order to maintain freedom of speech among the guests of the FEH, and in compliance with the Chatham House rules on which the FEH is based, only the general topics of the discussions are mentioned in this report.

This session covered the following topics:

- The definition of "State humanitarianism", and the identification of the sector's various actors and their relationships, interactions, and dynamics.

- The existence of French humanitarianism, one being of ventures without borders.

- The respect and the compatibility of humanitarian principles in the Crisis Centre's humanitarian responses, and how they are applied daily in the planning, execution, and evaluation of programmes in challenging situations.

- The Crisis Centre's dual mission of stabilisation and support. The example of Syria and the matter of areas under the regime's control were brought up.

- The role of the UN Security Council on the violation of IHL covering the security of humanitarian personnel.

- The issue of humanitarian access and of certain States stiffening their control over the action of international NGOs in their country. The trend toward national organisations and local actors reclaiming humanitarian action, and the role of NGOs in this regard.

- The dichotomy between the implementation of humanitarian programmes and the need to fight terrorism and achieve stability.

- The "nexus" and the "doxa" of the standard timeline of humanitarian emergency response leading to development, not always a straightforward process.

- The matter of sources of funding and the resulting ethical questions.

THE FEH MEETS WITH THE ICRC

Issues impacting the ICRC's development

The difficult task of speaking a **common language** with States. We no longer share the same understanding of humanitarian aid, humanitarian principles, and the worth of International Humanitarian Law.

- States are no longer able to build a consensus. The multilateral system is in a state of crisis, as exemplified by the Syrian question and the Security Council's inability to bear upon conflicting parties.

- The paradox of accountability of the States. Being obsessed with exposure to risk, they include in their funding mechanisms the transfer of risk to their partners through a strict system of compliance.

- New wars waged from afar, and the notion of exceptionalism while upholding IHL.

- The obsession with security and the States' massive investments on security matters.

What is to be done? What are the alliances? How can we discuss? Example given on the issue of war weapons exploding in populated areas, and the Vienna conference where the ICRC advocated an avoidance policy. Does this hold any promise? We need to press further on the matter of responsibility. For example, by asking States to adhere to the "human agency", that is to say, that all weapons must be systematically deployed by humans, rather than banning any specific weapon. We need to rethink of the ways we can relate these topics to matters involving IHL, so as to recreate alliances and exert an influence on States. Let us consider other groupings like cities and universities. Let us remain watchful and avoid an overly Western approach.

Collectively, we have lost our capacity to mobilise ourselves. The ways that mobilise change today no longer originate in the humanitarian sector, but from individuals who spring into action without leaders or structures (e.g. climate change, in Hong Kong, Algeria, Sudan, Tunisia, Egypt, etc.). The rise of a more elusive "new power" that can mobilise itself in an uncoordinated fashion through social networks is no longer attracted to the "old power" that we represent. This loss of attraction has been amplified by State measures taken to restrict NGOs (e.g. the UK government's strong criticism of Oxfam), which are widely accepted today and which would have been impossible 15 years ago. The balance of power between the States and NGOs is not a recent phenomenon, but the lack of inhibition is. Are NGOs no longer empowered by official morality? As our capacity to mobilise ourselves diminishes, how should we react collectively? Do new activist movements wish to seek alliances with us? Maybe they do intermittently, but we must accept that shifts are occurring outside our sphere of involvement.

We are also seeing a behavioural change in the people we help and protect. How do they perceive us? People nowadays express very different needs in terms of their mental vulnerability, their digital requirements, the importance of their personal data and protection. On the data issue, we need to position ourselves as the sole representatives of an ecosystem that holds the code of ethics required for data protection. We must think about our capacity to hear and understand needs requirements and avoid being considered merely as service providers. Let us work with local partners, listen to their needs, create social ties, and be more sensitive toward our own staff.

Finally, on the question of public or semi-public funding, how can we, to the greatest extent possible, avoid having funds specifically earmarked? How can the funding of protracted crises be guaranteed? How can we keep working in contexts that have been neglected? How can we assure the continuity of our actions in the settings of the CAR, Yemen, or Nigeria?

Digital transformation

As new needs arise, what initiatives can be set up to achieve digital transformation? How can we respond to the newly appearing risks associated with digital transformation, and, in particular, to the question of the digital tracking of personal data? When we are required to be neutral, independent, and impartial, and provide services based on trust, how can we apply digital transformation and adopt technologies that make us more steadfast to better fulfil our responsibilities?

In 2013, the ICRC's institutional strategy on digital transformation was based on two pillars: the creation of a data protection office and an internal structural framework designed to explain how the organisation is committed to digital transformation (an "information environment strategy").

This strategy has the following objectives:

- Data protection: to create the *Data Protection Handbook*, a manual of data protection fundamentals for humanitarian workers, and a report on metadata to explain the necessity for data protection in the humanitarian sphere (internally and for beneficiaries) with an explanation of digital risks.

- To identify new funding models for data protection. The issues related to new technologies and data protection go beyond the humanitarian sector and involve many who can potentially become partners. "Never just think in your corner and consider out-of-the-ordinary stakeholders". We must accept that the challenge of digitalisation is transversal.

With this in mind, various projects were set up:

- Creation of a virtual exchange platform with beneficiaries to serve for communication and to file important documents. A pilot project has already been developed around migrants.

- Data protection for beneficiaries and staff: the issue of GDPR compliance which involves a new type of fundraising.

- Use of virtual reality for educational and training purposes.

- An analysis of trends and algorithms used to identify potential IHL violations via social networks. What should be done with this information once it is collected?

- Use of facial recognition algorithms to facilitate family reunification by creating a connection between in-house data and public data available on Facebook, for example. But what about the ethical issues? Compliance mechanisms provide for a closer look at ethical considerations. An internal "safe space" must be set aside for this type of discussion to happen.

- How can IHL be adapted with regard to data protection? In this case does IHL apply during peacetime when data has been falsified? What about the violence of digital repression?

- Collaboration with universities - R&D: the challenge is to work on the development of new technologies without being sure that they will work. However, before using them we must be able to experiment with them to check that they are operative.

Alerts:

- Be careful of requests from companies that claim to have the technology that will revolutionise humanitarian action, and that go through NGOs to experiment with population groups receiving aid. But what about the Grand Bargain which encourages interoperability with the private sector and the sharing of information systems?

- When creating partnerships, we need ensure that we have the in-house skills to understand how data collection works. New models must be found to evaluate and judge the relevance of such partnerships. Collaboration with *Grandes écoles* holds promise in this case.

- Take into account that 60% of cyber risks arise internally. Employees must be trained on these issues to ensure that structures are secure.

ICRC's mandate and needs evolving

The ICRC, whose historical role has been to ensure that prisoners of war and their families stay in touch, has expanded its responsibilities to include the search for missing persons and reunification of family members. This is major challenge. Today, the ICRC's specific programmes deal with detained persons, the protection of civilian populations, and restoration of family ties (persons separated, missing, or deceased).

In the coming years, the main challenges in this area will include:

- Data capitalisation (for algorithm development leading to improved research, data protection, etc.),

- Greater involvement of National Societies in research,

- Data protection in case of armed conflict,

- *Capacity building* at the CICR in relation to national policies in science.

On the matter of the protection of civilian populations, the ICRC wishes to get better feedback from programme beneficiaries through a community approach. Call centres have been set up to hear what concerned people receiving help from the ICRC have to say. This platform is intended to reach out to as many people as possible, so that the impact of ICRC's activities can be better assessed. How can the long-term impact of a sustainable response be measured? The ICRC began by identifying the indicators to measure this impact, which is easier to carry out in the areas of sanitation and economic security than in those of protection. The ICRC is also working to send instructors out in the field to teach about protection and to provide further training to the increasing number of expatriate personnel on topics related to protection (inclusion, needs assessment, understanding and identifying those who are excluded).

The ICRC has also published, "Protection Standards for Protection Work". The third edition discusses the issue of data protection. Protection standards are increasingly difficult to enforce. For this reason, we must think of different ways to wield influence and strengthen the role of humanitarian diplomacy.

The Red Cross Movement advises all organisations committed to the protection of human rights and international law to take an approach that, at a minimum, emphasises the "Do no harm" and the "Do not ignore" principles and that recognises the onset of a protection problem.

To guarantee that ICRC can carry out its work in protection and to provide protection where access is difficult, digital resources are used to supplement ICRC's close physical presence notably provided by National Societies.

Standards and conformity programmes

When humanitarian aid has been called into question or when scandals concerning certain aid workers have been uncovered, it is absolutely essential to abide to the rules to act efficiently. The integrity model run by the ICRC (to decide on partnerships, strategic planning, compliance programmes, etc.) is based on three aspects:

- Culture – that is, the system of shared values and beliefs – governs behaviours and interactions. Culture regulates the way people exchange with each another. It acts as a compass and a control mechanism in informal settings. Conformity plays an important role in defining expectations and in promoting transparency.

- "Internal justice", which promotes integrity and assures equality.

- Internal conformity, which guarantees that the structure remains whole.

The decision to develop a conformity programme resulted from an internal assessment of the manner in which staff behaviour was managed and treated using fully decentralised means (each delegation individually determining whether the protocol had been violated and the type of sanction to apply). In an organisation which has grown exponentially, a centralised system with a global conformity office, was in itself a measure that mitigated risk. In 2018, the ICRC worked on conceptualizing a global approach to risk management as good management practice to clarify processes, roles, and responsibilities of each. Internal controls were set up to produce reliable and accurate reports (internal, external, financial, non-financial) and to ensure conformity with in-house regulations and standards.

This being a very technical area, the global conformity office has worked on clarifying concepts such as "internal control", "internal audit" or "oversight", terms that have been gradually adopted by the organisation. This office has also endeavoured to design policies and procedures intended to effectively apply the 2004 code of conduct, to develop educational materials (such as e-learning, coursework, communication tools) and coordinate prevention (carried out by field operatives, human resource personnel, etc.)

Investigations, the most operational aspect of conformity programmes, are meant to ensure that the ICRC remains an independent, unified, and caring organisation that is fully centralised in its management of allegations of misconduct. The investigative unit of the Global Conformity Office is responsible for investigating all types of cases and allegations of code of conduct violations. In terms of figures, the investigation unit's work has covered 344 allegations of potential professional misconduct and 286 investigations, 48% of which related to fraud. Also included are cases related to employee relations (for example, harassment in the workplace, exploitation and sexual abuse). The investigation is a very formal and independent management process. It is carried out by qualified professionals, investigators experienced in law enforcement, and forensic experts.

However, the growing demand for disclosures of behaviour is difficult to reconcile with the integrity of the process, but this can happen, if there is no room for interpretation when identifying a misconduct.

RECAPS OF THE WORKSHOPS

Rapporteurs gave a recap of each workshop during the plenary session. Their information sheets report the following conclusions.

FEH
FORUM ESPACE HUMANITAIRE

Workshop "Transformations in humanitarian access"

1- Main topics discussed?
- What has really changed in recent years? Are French ONG victims of these changes?

Little change in having access granted for relief, but the risk has shifted to French ONGs who have been penalised by the enactment of laws against terrorism.
- How far can discussions and negotiations go with other actors in the field?

We must submit to the sovereignty that some States have reaffirmed, just as informal groups who undermine the actions of NGOs, such as terrorists, must do.
- How can these risks be managed?

Tension between our need for visibility and ensuing surveillance. Our need to act vs. our dread of sanctions in a context of precautions and withdrawal.

2- Main recommendations?
- Look more at the strengths of French ONGs instead of feeling victimized.
- Leave action and development aside to make room for strategy and innovation.
- Accept reality and adapt by thinking "out of the box" without losing sight of our objectives
- Accept our responsibilities and encourage our interlocutors to do likewise.

3- Looking further?
- Stronger coordination between French NGOs to denounce, explain, influence
- Have laws enforced whatever may be the priorities for security.

FEH
FORUM ESPACE HUMANITAIRE

Workshop "Personal commitment and citizen involvement"

1- Main topics discussed?
- Conduct a self-diagnosis based on our mistakes, as well as on our successes and our strengths.
- How can we become again channels of transmission for each other, and how can we effectively connect to civil societies of the South (NGOs, social movements, and especially population groups)?

2- Main recommendations?
- Accept the loss of control
- Improve governance and diversity
- Collective action

FEH
FORUM ESPACE HUMANITAIRE

Workshop "Innovations and Humanitarian Aid"

1- Main topics discussed?
- What is innovation? Technical, organisational, transformational, R&D, etc.
- Why do we innovate? To adapt to tomorrow's challenges and to justify our existence
- Who innovates? NGOs vs the scientific sector, start-ups, businesses, etc.
- How do we innovate? Top-down (strategy) vs bottom-up (participative approach)
- What are the means allocated to innovation? Tension between the means allocated to conformity vs to operations

2- Main recommendations?
- Work in association with other actors and plan collectively for innovation
- Make innovation part of an overall strategy: the best way to respond to the duty to humanity
- Promote in-house innovation as a lever for building loyalty and motivating staff
- Instill a feeling and a state of mind for innovation and prepare personnel for future changes

3- Looking further?
- Not only innovate on "doing" but especially on "being". Challenge the very existence of NGOs.
- Reposition ourselves away from acting as intermediaries between donors and beneficiaries.
- Move from mediating function (vertical model) towards a service provider function based on expertise (horizontal model) where everyone can have their say.
- Question how "human" will fit in tomorrow's humanitarianism.

FEH
FORUM ESPACE HUMANITAIRE

Workshop "Alliances, coalitions, and pooling of resources: wishful thinking or a must?"

Pooling means the optimization of resources, goods, and means of transport through sharing.

- Why pooling? Efficiency, optimisation, impact. To go straight to the heart of the matter, to reach those who are the most vulnerable. While the private sector is not allowed to pool, donors and the humanitarian sector can.
- A review of the concept, "coopetition", a model combining cooperation and competition.
- Twelve aspects of pooling and four large pooling projects:
  - Training – presented by Gilles Collard (Bioforce) and Joël Weiler (Médecins du Monde)
  - Shared logistics – presented RLH (11 organisations) and ACF
  - Research in knowledge, monitoring, and evaluation – presented by Véronique de Geoffroy (Groupe URD)
  - Sharing of structural costs – presented by Manuel Patrouillard (HI)
- Two other pooling projects:
  - Expatriate taxation presented by Coordination Sud
  - Alliance Urgence already has six member organisations

INTER-MINISTERIAL EVALUATION OF THE HUMANITARIAN EMERGENCY FUND

Presentation of the inter-ministerial evaluation of the humanitarian emergency fund (HEF), an instrument of the Crisis and Support Centre (CDCS), for the period 2015-2018 and commissioned by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The objectives of this study were to a) make a situational analysis and an evaluation of this instrument, b) analyse its relevance (what needs has it met? what objectives?), c) assess the financial leverage effect (does it finance projects that NGOs could not have funded without this instrument?), and d) analyse the coordination of the French humanitarian response and measure the effectiveness of the HEF-funded interventions. It will be a matter of setting up a qualitative analysis based on interviews with various stakeholders (a sampling of ministries, partners, beneficiaries, NGOs, to reflect a balance in terms of crisis zones, types of funding, size of NGOs, etc.), and of field missions.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Four trends emerged from these discussions:

- o **The growing complexity** of humanitarian crises (e.g. Ebola) and the kaleidoscope of players scenarios, challenges, etc.

- o **The complementarity** among national and international French NGOs with UN agencies, among humanitarian organisations and businesses, researchers, civil society and other actors lying outside the humanitarian sphere.

- o **The convergence,** rather than the counterproductive compartmentalisation, of humanitarian action, development, peacekeeping, and social transformation.

- o **Empathy**, the attribute required to generate a human bond between humanitarian staff and the people we serve.

The SDGs have ambitious objectives. What are we to do to with the "Leave no one behind"? What are the priorities of the Grand Bargain? What will become of the Nexus? How are environmental issues to be understood? All of our organisations are developing successful advocacy campaigns, yet we are making less of an impact on public opinion. Do we need a humanitarian Greta Thunberg?

The question of generational changes

To reach a dialogue between different generations, we must find a way to reaffirm the story of humanitarianism. The gap is widening between humanitarian staff and reality on the ground (increasing number of procedures, reports, monitoring activities, evaluations).

How can we share the humanitarian commitment that motivates us? Young people today are very committed. What have we gotten wrong that prevents us from connecting with them? Today's economic model sustains the power of technocracy. The humanitarian approach is based on a desire to come together and on an inquisitiveness for others. Nowadays, humanitarianism has come to oppose "being together" (prison environments, separate timetables, military convoys, etc.). Security issues and technocratic power have weakened human relationships. Let us try to have greater interchange.

Advise young people to expose themselves to the "danger of amateurism", etymologically speaking, and to search within themselves the points of contact that will help them become useful. There is a generational divide between young people seeking to be radical, and us, the "dignitaries", the institutionalists, wary and adverse to risk, diplomatically minded and ready to negotiate. This gap is hard to overcome, and all the more so in that we give young people little arm room.

A proposal to pool resources was made to address the issue of mentorship. How can we make ourselves available to the younger generations? We need to show them that we care about them and that we need them. Our work has become more professional, and rightly so, yet we must arouse interest in the younger generations for the decision-making bodies of NGOs. We must stay dynamic and think of new forms of commitment and new models for our organisations.

"CONVICTIONS" SESSION

The 2019 edition of the "Convictions" session was devoted to "The new generation of humanitarian leaders". What drives us today? Injustice, the attitude of others, the global meaning of our actions, which must be elevated to the rank of a universal system, and renunciation through selfless commitment.

The institutionalisation of our organisations is troublesome, but it is a testimony of a sustainable set of values that puts human beings at the endpoint, that places selflessness as a pivot in the play for power, in one that speaks to us of humility. Leaders have a duty of setting an example and of having the courage not to please, to decide, and to control their emotions. Let us preserve the sincerity, the modesty, and the clarity of our words and of our actions, because confidence emanates from this. Let us be confident in that what we do is good, in that our relationships with others is virtuous, and this helps build peace. Let us call into question our way of doing things coming from a "white, atheist, Western" point of view. Let us open up the way, one that is less black-and-white, and let us convince

ourselves that selflessness is at the crux of all of this. We must always be driven by the standpoint of others.

Humanitarian organisations are not the sole bearers of humanism or of humanitarian aid. There is something much deeper harboured within each individual. We are each capable of doing humanitarian work, of utilising our skills and our professions to work toward a humanitarian objective. NGOs are created to meet needs. Faced with a crisis, faced with a disaster, citizens mobilise themselves, and build structures that are specifically designed to respond to them, but doomed to disappear. But the structures we are creating must adapt and evolve in the same way as do the crises we encounter. Humanitarian aid is like the myth of Sisyphus. With this in mind, let us be ready to recreate the wheel at each new development.

NGOs often operate in a survival mode, keeping their organisations barely afloat and trying to apply a model that no longer works. We get the impression that their goal is to expand when it should rather be to relieve suffering. How should this trend be treated? We talk a lot about procedures and cost reduction, but we must return to the formulation of ideas and principles and deliver a greater humanitarian impact. Let us build bridges between humanitarian workers and developers and give value to our know-how and our expertise. We must allow those involved in development, those who have real experience in building partnerships with local organisations, to gain access wherever we do. Let us ask ourselves very early on how we can fit into a public policy framework, in which the capacity of local organisations is strengthened. Let us use the right terms to describe the bridges connecting cultures that are so different.

In France, since we have a real tendency to flagellate ourselves, we find it hard to value our major successes. Let us strive to identify them, and allocate more resources for greater creativity in our actions. We must invest in research, allocate resources that will make us more convincing. Let us take innovation as a thought process: "Innovate for what?" And let us make sure that our innovations are replicable and that they have been planned with local communities, so that they carry meaning, and, above all, relevance.

We must ensure that the settings we have helped develop are sustainable. We must bear responsibility both at individual and institutional levels. Stakeholders are not the sole beneficiaries of projects, but also the people from within the organisation. We cannot talk about humanity and then make decisions that are not humane. We need to think about the impact of our actions, so that communities receiving aid are disrupted in the least. Let us not take more than what we give and let us give with respect. Empathy and dignity are key. Every organisation has its mission, but the framework of that mission is just a tool from which we must be able to detach ourselves. The so-called southern NGOs require the expertise and the organisational and managerial skills that we can provide, but the project design must originate in the field. Local funding is multi-faceted.

From this perspective, everyone seems to agree politically on the principle of localisation. But in practice how does this apply in the field? In setting up localisation, we must, in all cases, maintain ties with the people being helped thanks to international solidarity, and keep an open dialogue.

We are immensely accountable to our beneficiaries, but much more to those for whom we exist, i.e. people. We are indebted to donors who are providers of aid, who support us and whom we represent. The lack of concern for people is perhaps one of the reasons for the revival of citizen movements in this civil society that we are meant to embody. We must give civil society the opportunity to act. We must view ourselves as a conduit for their commitment and restore to citizens their feeling of being actively involved.

Recent concerns (e.g. climate change, deadlocked conflicts, etc.) require a different approach. We must identify cross-national causes, and the cause for climatic change is undoubtedly one of them. We must think ahead and build bridges between the world of tomorrow that will be radically different in terms of energy, our relationship to nature, and the economy. And this includes humanitarian action. We are committed to serving others. What are our responsibilities as humanitarians today on the issue of climate change? We have the duty of getting politically involved. We are the front-line eyewitnesses ready to act as key players in mobilisation. Let us come together around the newly formed and existing mobilisations and take our place as humanitarians.

ANNEXES. WORKSHOP GUIDELINES

<div align="center">

GUIDELINES FOR THE ROUND TABLE:

NEUTRAL, IMPARTIAL, AND INDEPENDENT - LOOKING TOWARDS 2030?

Round table 1 - Thursday October 3, 2019, 3:00 p.m.-4:30 p.m.

</div>

Introductory paragraph (appearing on the FEH program)

What has really marked the humanitarian sector in the last 10 years? What have been the constants? The developments? The fractures? What lessons have we learned today? What should be noteworthy in the next 10 years?

Contributors

Introduction by the Steering Committee

Moderator:

- **Virginie Troit,** General Director, French Red Cross Foundation

Speakers:

- **Cécile Aptel,** Director of Policy, Strategy and Knowledge, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

- **Claus Haugaard Sorensen,** diplomat and former Director General of ECHO

- **Dr. Richard Kojan,** Physician, President of Alima

Guidelines

Part 1. Now in the tenth year of the FEH, we would like to open the discussions with a report covering a historical perspective of the issues faced by various organizations, as well as the constants, the disruptions, and the developments that have marked the humanitarian sector over the last ten years.

Since 2009, the year the first FEH was launched, the humanitarian sector and each of your organizations have been affected by numerous crises and emergencies: destructive disasters sizeable enough to devastate an entire country like Haiti, the Philippines, or just recently the Bahamas, the Arab spring and the Syrian crisis, the wars in Yemen, Sudan, and South Sudan, the mass migration of the Rohingyas, the issue of migration on several continents, the exponential rise in the numbers of refugees and IDPs, the spread of epidemics such as Ebola, the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit and its recommendations for local control that are somewhat difficult to apply, the SDGs and the awareness of global warming and its likely acceleration. The boundaries between "here" and "there", and the issues of peace, emergency vs long-term intervention, the North vs the South are, more than ever, being put to the test.

Part 2. Our sector, having developed on the basis of humanitarian principles, has grown steadily since 2009 in response to ever-rising needs. What about in 2019? How are NGOs and international aid providers preparing for the next decade? In terms of perspectives, what are the main lines of action:

a) When pursuing current general trends;

b) In view of changes or disruptions that are less likely to occur during this period of transition?

How can humanitarian action anticipate these? Is there enough upfront preparation? Are our principles still a real factor and who are the ones opting for other principles? And which principles?

These different questions will be discussed with participants in relation to the structuring of the humanitarian sector (or sectors), the governance and the norms of international and national NGOs, the involvement of hybrid groups, and the impact of technological advances. The three speakers will explain how their organizations have accounted for these points since 2009 and through to 2030 to deal with these issues, and how they have developed operational strategies for the coming decade:

• Cécile Aptel /IFRC and the challenges of the 2030 Strategy

• Claus Sorensen/The challenges and the real issues facing the multilateral and bilateral provision of aid in the aftermath of the World Humanitarian Summit

• Richard Kojan/The emergence of hybrid groups and partnerships with the South, as in the case of the Alima platform

Part 3.

Over the next 10 years, to what extent will non-institutional fora such as the FEH still be relevant, and for which groups and with which objectives?

Should these for be expanded or redefined? What about their networking?

Recommendations for the speakers and the facilitator

Speakers will have eight minutes at most for their introduction that should launch the discussions. The speakers are free to intervene during the exchanges as often as they wish. The role of the Moderator will be to point out the specific issues to be addressed by each speaker and to manage the floor during the discussions. Each speaker will be contacted personally by the Moderator to define the theme of his intervention.

GUIDELINES FOR THE WORKSHOP:
TRANSFORMATIONS IN HUMANITARIAN ACCESS
Workshop 1 – Thursday, October 3, 2019, 5:00 p.m.-7:00 p.m.

Introductory paragraph (appearing on the FEH program)

The transformations of humanitarian access will be discussed here, first, from the angle of the State's assertion/reaffirmation of its sovereignty and its tight administrative constraints, and, second, the politicization of aid. The impact of the changing nature of conflicts, as well as the risks related to the greater use of local organizations and their staff will also be discussed. What are the adaptations, the mechanisms, and the practices that our organizations can set up to deal with these developments? What should be the role of collective advocacy at the European level?

Hosts

- **Florence Daunis,** Deputy Director General of Operations and Technical Resources, Handicap International Federation
- **Alexandre Giraud**, Director General, Solidarités International
- **Michael Neuman,** Directeur of Studies, CRASH-MSF

Facilitator :
- Karl Blanchet, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine/Geneva CERAH

Rapporteur: to be announced

Guidelines

The title of the workshop implicitly suggests that the access to populations who are at risk, who are vulnerable and in need has been substantially restricted in recent years. The hosts will begin clarifying this initial supposition by recalling some of the semantic definitions that are needed for enlightened discussions. They will attempt to distinguish different types of crisis situations, and clearly describe the characteristics of exceptionally severe crises, like the one that has occurred in Syria. Has access to populations really been restricted? If so, how can changes in acquiring access be more fully explained?
Other topics will be tackled in connection with humanitarian access, such as the politicization of aid, the administrative constraints to access tied to international developments (banking compliance, anti-terrorist measures, extra-territoriality of US law, etc.), as well as national sovereignty, which has supposedly become a hot topic in today's discourse. Also, to be mentioned are the characteristics of some of today's conflicts, where the frontline is often set in the midst of civilian neighborhoods, and where the distinction between combatants and noncombatants is often blurred. In this context, how can gaining access to populations be negotiated? What are the compromises that international organizations must make when they negotiate? Can we conceive a notion of "European-wide advocacy", or do our positions differ to the point that we must resort to "reasoned skepticism"?

Objectives of the workshop :
1. To find a common agreement on the degree of humanitarian access to populations at risk that transcends our different points of view
2. To identify the strategies that we can collective apply to improve the supply of humanitarian aid and protection

Recommendations for the hosts and the facilitator

In order to promote interaction and discussions among FEH participants, each workshop will be introduced by two or three hosts whose role will be to define the scope of the discussions. The hosts will each launch the discussions by presenting their point of view for five to ten minutes. The floor will then be passed on to all participants. The facilitator will ensure that the discussions run smoothly, and the host may intervene if desired.

The workshop is prepared ahead of time with the facilitator who advises the hosts and liaises with the organizers. The hosts and the facilitator can agree on the best way to make the workshop dynamic and have it generate ideas and concrete results.

The rapporteur, preferably chosen ahead of time among the workshop participants, will be responsible for presenting the summary of the discussions during the plenary session on Friday afternoon.

PERSONAL COMMITMENT AND CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

Workshop 2 – Thursday, October 3, 2019, 5:00 p.m.-7:00 p.m.

Introductory paragraph (appearing on the FEH program)

Issues related to citizen involvement and individual commitment in our organizations. What are the new types of commitment that express solidarity? Citizen involvement: how to re-enlist support, generate greater impact on policies, address the major challenges related to global warming, respect for international law, self-withdrawal, and the rise of extremism? How to attract the younger generation? How to extend the democratic process? How can we take into account citizen action that is carried outside the traditional framework of NGOs of the North, as well as of the South. The matter of advocacy and the focus on innovative modes of action: "judicialization" and the search for new alliances in civil society.

Hosts

- **Antonio Donini,** co-founder of United Against Inhumanity
- **Cécile Duflot**, General Director, Oxfam France

Facilitator

- Boris Martin

Rapporteur: to be announced

Guidelines

The workshop will begin with the video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rgYaZAUzwuY

This video, sent to the participants prior to the workshop, retransmits the speech of the Indian writer, Arundhati Roy. It was transcribed in the article "Les périls du tout-humanitaire," published by *Le Monde Diplomatique* in October 2004.

Arundhati Roy's vibrant talk must clearly challenge us. Her speech may seem to us, in some respects, too caricatural[2] and it may paradoxically support the view described in "The Tears of the White Man", expressing the self-perceived guilt that our organizations have never been freed from. It is true that we can be proud of our achievements, of our actions, of our campaigns, of being simply who we are. But this speech must still, 15 years later, push us to honestly question ourselves. Calmly but in all sincerity.

We can in fact refute some of Arundhati Roy's remarks, but we cannot help but hear her talk of a resonance of mistrust, even hostility, displayed by certain populations that we seek to save just like we would save the citizens/potential donors in our own countries. And we cannot help noticing in our society the younger generation's lack of interest toward our organizations, which the older generation used to cite as examples of what represents a "serious" commitment. In examining the root causes for this indifference, is there not the feeling that NGOs are relieving the States of their responsibilities (by allowing them to make savings in the process), and that they act as facilitators of globalization, the cause of so much harm to populations?

Have we not, as NGOs, ended up monopolizing the mobilization of citizen support–technically and not ideologically speaking? Have we not been led to believe that the quasi-official representatives of civil society, who are actually people and not NGOs, are too often the "deciders"? Our somewhat justifiable excuse is that we are the spokespersons for those who have no say, yet have we not failed to hear the strong voice of our "beneficiaries" - our "victims" - and of those who can no longer put up with "the rule of NGOs " that we seem to represent for many? How can we catalyze the expectations of citizens, activists, and "victims", so that they, in turn, come to support our common efforts?

Workshop participants will be able to ask questions about personal commitment within our organizations and citizen involvement. What are the new types of commitment that can express solidarity? How can we re-enlist support, generate greater impact on policies, address the major challenges related to global warming, respect for international law, self-withdrawal, and the rise of extremism? How to attract the younger generation? How to extend the democratic process? The matter of advocacy will also be explored, including new modes of action such as "judicialization" and the search for new alliances in civil society.

3 objectives:

1. To arrive at a true self-diagnosis and an evaluation of our shortcomings and our excesses, of our successes and our strengths,

2. To determine how we can once again transmit the expectations and the sentiments of insurrection of populations we defend, and how we can effectively connect with civil societies (NGOs, social activists, and people in general) in countries of the South,

3. To determine how we can oppose the neoliberal offensive that is expressed by the constraints imposed by public donors, by the terms of partnerships proposals with private enterprises, and more generally by the changes in our modes of operation of our NGOs in their finances and management, leading to disenchantment and stereotyped communication.

Recommendations for the hosts and the facilitator

In order to promote interaction and discussions among FEH participants, each workshop will be introduced by two or three hosts whose role will be to define the scope of the discussions. The hosts will each launch the discussions by presenting their point of view for five to ten minutes. The floor will then be passed on to all participants. The facilitator will ensure that the discussions run smoothly, and the host may intervene if desired.

The workshop is prepared ahead of time with the facilitator who advises the hosts and liaises with the organizers. The hosts and the facilitator can agree on the best way to make the workshop dynamic and have it generate ideas and concrete results.

The rapporteur, preferably chosen ahead of time among the workshop participants, will be responsible for presenting the summary of the discussions during the plenary session on Friday afternoon.

WORKSHOP GUIDELINES

INNOVATIONS AND HUMANITARIAN AID

Workshop 3 – Thursday, Octobre 3, 2019, 5:00 p.m.-7:00 p.m.

Introductory paragraph (appearing on the FEH program)

Today, how should we understand " innovation "? Should this term be restricted to development and the use of new technologies (virtual reality, unmanned vehicles, etc.)? Is innovation an expedient that humanitarians use to rationalize their own existence and their own relevance as they modernize their long-established courses of action? What are the troubling, the experimental, and the ethical aspects of innovation? Is a new form of humanitarian aid emerging? Have we not overused the term "innovation"? Is it still synonymous with added-value? With progress?

Hosts

- **Nan Buzard,** Director of Innovation, ICRC
- **Marie-Pierre Caley,** General Director, ACTED
- **Emmanuel Guillaud,** Secretarial Lead, Transformational Investment Capacity (TIC), MSF

Facilitator

- *Audrey Sala*

Rapporteur: to be announced

Guidelines

Today, how should we understand "innovation"? Should this term be restricted to development and the use of new technologies (virtual reality, unmanned vehicles, etc.)? What are the troubling, the experimental, and the ethical aspects of innovation? Have we not overused the term "innovation"? Is it still synonymous with added-value? With progress?

For some, innovation is the catalyst needed to adapt to the profound transformations underway; a way for humanitarians to "continue to rationalize their own existence and their own relevance as they modernize their long-established courses of action ".

For others, this approach to innovation will not solve "real" problems. The historical humanitarian thought process is "obsolete" and a new form of humanitarian aid is "bursting at the seams" of outdated structures. We must therefore face up to the profound upheavals that will follow and that will inevitably lead to a "controlled revolution". The challenge for traditional humanitarians is to either evolve or disappear. Consequently, they must undergo a drastic paradigm shift.

In practice, how has innovation been incorporated by humanitarian organizations into their structures and modes of operation? What are its positive and/or negative impacts on the humanitarian sector? What are its identifiable risks?

Fundamentally, isn't the main issue raised by innovation the "why", rather than the "what" or the "how"? For which purpose and for which strategic objective? What loss would there be of not taking on innovation? How can we stay open to change and continue adapting, yet still remain essentially "humanitarian"?

The issue is, certainly above all, a matter of intention. We must therefore look towards the future while bearing in mind the changes that are underway. We must differentiate between what troubles us and what can be of use to help us. Rather than taking a defensive attitude, we must project ourselves forward, all while reflecting on how to stay "humanitarian".

With their values, their skills and their experience, French NGOs are better equipped than others to meet this challenge, with a watchful eye, yet with optimism, assertiveness (that is, an outlook that

reconciles self-affirmation and respect for others), and determination.

Recommendations for the hosts and the facilitator

In order to promote interaction and discussions among FEH participants, each workshop will be introduced by two or three hosts whose role will be to define the scope of the discussions. The hosts will each launch the discussions by presenting their point of view for five to ten minutes. The floor will then be passed on to all participants. The facilitator will ensure that the discussions run smoothly, and the host may intervene if desired.

The workshop is prepared ahead of time with the facilitator who advises the hosts and liaises with the organizers. The hosts and the facilitator can agree on the best way to make the workshop dynamic and have it generate ideas and concrete results.

The rapporteur, preferably chosen ahead of time among the workshop participants, will be responsible for presenting the summary of the discussions during the plenary session on Friday afternoon.

WORKSHOP GUIDELINES:
ALLIANCES, COALITIONS AND POOLING OF RESOURCES: WISHFUL THINKING OR A MUST?
Workshop 4 – Thursday October 3, 2019, 5 p.m.-7 p.m.

Introductory paragraph (appearing on the FEH program)

French NGOs have demonstrated their skills in forming alliances, coalitions, and even mergers, often with outstanding outcomes. This has not been the case with the pooling of resources.

In an increasingly complex world, where our very existence is under threat, how can NGOs redefine their roles in this domain, beyond the associations they have established, to meet the expectations of donors? How can we work together to create initiatives that will substantially impact our effectiveness and our alliances?

Hosts

- **Jean-Baptiste Lamarche,** representative, RLH, Bioport and Logistics Director of ACF-France
- **Manuel Patrouillard,** Director, Handicap International Federation

Facilitator:

- *Jean-Baptiste Richardier*

Rapporteur: to be announced

Guidelines

Growing humanitarian needs coupled with funding shortages represent a challenge for humanitarian organizations, not only when collecting donations, but also when seeking better efficiency in the use of available funds. This issue was pointedly brought up in the context of the Grand Bargain, but no obvious answers have since been arrived at. One possible path to optimize the use of funds that has been insufficiently explored lies in the way organizations work together to maximize their humanitarian impact and, ideally, to better serve aid beneficiaries.

Consortia, alliances, coalitions, mergers, etc. are some of the examples of what may or may not work effectively. Consortia have become the norm for donors and all major humanitarian NGOs have fallen back on these. Alliances covering a multitude of subject areas have been increasingly developed in a creative flurry that is characteristic of civil society. In addition to thematic alliances that have demonstrated their impact and their relevance and built by coalitions for a specific cause for the duration of a campaign, there are network alliances that have not always been credibly efficient, the benefits often having being watered down by running costs.

Aside from some networks that have successfully merged, there are few examples of pooling/sharing/ partaking of resources among NGOs, yet this has not affected the identity of our NGOs in terms of their social missions, their advocacy, or their communication.

There is a double paradox:

- what drives NGOs to work together within consortia, to build broad advocacy coalitions, to forge alliances and even mergers, when they are comparatively very reluctant to pool resources?

- why, when it comes to the pooling of resources that potentially generates much higher efficiency and effectiveness, are there so few collective agreements among humanitarian actors, considering that nothing or almost nothing prevents them, and that business enterprises around the world are in fact engaged in these even when restrictions have been imposed?

Interesting questions can be raised. Are such rapprochements now being seriously considered and examined? Are they really beneficial? Will they respond to real needs? Are economies of scale expected? Will they result in win-win situations? Are they simple to achieve? Will a greater number of beneficiaries be reached? Will they strengthen the humanitarian system as a whole (with a systemic approach)?

This workshop therefore aims to delve into the specific question of the pooling and sharing of

resources and of skills that were, up till now, developed within NGOs.

This can be done first by delineating what already exists and what works and by examining what can be improved upon and developed, without lingering on the reasons for the usual unwillingness of French NGOs.

To help address these points during the workshop, we have prepared a non-exhaustive list of the many obstacles to greater collaboration among our NGOs:

- The lack of formalized/professionalized processes, especially in HR, finances, and IT

- The assumption that pooling/outsourcing is contrary to autonomy and freedom of action

- The disregard for the value of levers of action, which have been incorrectly perceived as mere management tools

- Having to forever recreate the wheel, which tends to thwart any plans to pool resources

- Extreme policies/ideologies ill-suited to compromise on matters, such as less visible support functions

- The obsession with custody and control (real or imagined)

- A lack of understanding of the potential benefits, and a poor estimation of the gain in efficiency and effectiveness

- Difficulty/inability to reconcile competition and cooperation (the concept of competitiveness through cooperation)

- The search for ideally "universal" solutions (to satisfy all)

- Resources not allocated to resolve this issue as a matter of priority

This workshop is meant to have participants reflect on possible solutions and satisfactory outcomes. We ask that participants to review the following list of suggested topics at the beginning of the workshop and formulate a position for each one during the discussions:

- Training: existing university or para-university courses (Bioforce, Master's programs, etc.) for developing the skills of national personnel are notoriously underutilized by NGOs. There is no sharing of e-learning platforms or field training sessions;

- Taxation and social security contributions for expatriates: a common policy would be very useful to facilitate mobility among NGOs and avoid the "tax-shopping" that is becoming more widespread in host countries;

- HR: recruitment and management of experts (in energy, ICT, etc.) that would make it possible, by sharing resources, to make the best use of hard-to-find skills;

- Logistics: Bioport, Atlas Logistique, MSF Logistique, etc. are examples of supply/logistics platforms that are underutilized or closed to third parties, despite having been shown to be useful and sustained by donors;

- Purchasing: initiatives to organize group purchases of equipment, goods, and services are still too unsystematic;

- Collection platforms: there is the usual long-standing reluctance that has been overcome with Alliance Urgence, but it still must prove itself; Street Mkg is facing growing disagreement among parties;

- IT: little or no shared software (finance, logistics, project management, HR, etc.), no common hotline;

- Local field structures (warehouses, offices, vehicles, etc.): very little sharing of facilities.

Purpose of the workshop:

- To reflect on the main ways for structuring in the coming years;

- To focus on certain priority topics with those who "want to take action";

- To identify the options that can lead to collectively applying initiatives and encouraging possible individual commitments.

Suggested steps:

- Introduction by the two hosts;

- Time for formulating answers and discussions;

- Time for coming up with a position and affirming a commitment

- Recap of the conclusions in the plenary session.

Recommendations for the hosts and the facilitator

In order to promote interaction and discussions among FEH participants, each workshop will be introduced by two or three hosts whose role will be to define the scope of the discussions. The hosts will each launch the discussions by presenting their point of view for five to ten minutes. The floor will then be passed on to all participants. The facilitator will ensure that the discussions run smoothly, and the host may intervene if desired.

The workshop is prepared ahead of time with the facilitator who advises the hosts and liaises with the organizers. The hosts and the facilitator can agree on the best way to make the workshop dynamic and have it generate ideas and concrete results.

The rapporteur, preferably chosen ahead of time among the workshop participants, will be responsible for presenting the summary of the discussions during the plenary session on Friday afternoon.

<p style="text-align:center">GUIDELINES</p>

<p style="text-align:center">THE FEH MEETS WITH THE ICRC</p>

<p style="text-align:center">*Friday, October 4, 2019, 10:00 a.m.-4:45 p.m.*</p>

Technical aspects

Part I. Meeting with Yves Daccord   10:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.

We suggest that the meeting be held in three parts:

First part:
- Presentation and identification of the main challenges that have impacted the development of the ICRC up to now, and the challenges he expects for the future (30 min)
- A FEH member's report on the topics discussed the previous day related to the issues raised by Mr. Yves Daccord (10 min)
- Exchanges with the audience (20 min)

Second part:
- In-depth discussion on certain topics mentioned earlier (30 min)

Third part:
- Exchanges with the audience (30 min)

N.B.: A questionnaire will be sent to participants before this meeting to determine the topics that interest FEH members. The OC will transmit these findings to Mr. Yves Daccord <u>a week before his intervention</u>.

Part II. Meeting with Department Directors   1:45 p.m. – 4:45 p.m.

To stimulate interchange between the directors and the participants, we plan to split each sub-section into two parts: the intervention (20 min), and exchanges with the participants (40 min).

The interventions are scheduled as follows:

- 1:45 p.m.- 2:45 p.m.: Exchange with **Charlotte Lindsey**, Director in charge of digital transformation
- 2:45 p.m.- 3:45 p.m.: Exchange with **Sarah Epprecht**, Deputy Director of variable humanitarian relief operations and ICRC's responses
- 3:45 p.m.- 4:45 p.m.: Exchange with **Maria Thestrup**, Head of the compliance group setting up the ICRC compliance office

Fundamental aspects

Part I. Meeting with Yves Daccord   10:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.

Following an initial meeting with the ICRC delegation in Paris, the OC presents below some of the questions for Mr. Yves Daccord that can stimulate discussion:

- What is your perception of French NGOs and of the role they have, or should have?

- What do you believe are the needs developing in the field? What role do beneficiaries have and how do they position themselves? Who are the humanitarians that can respond?

- What is the ICRC's alliance strategy,
    - particularly at the local and operational level?
    - but also, in terms of its influence: for example, how can it better work in synergy with NGOs? How can we, as NGOs, better « implement » the ICRC's political leverage and transmit a common message?

- How is today's world perceived and what are the future scenarios to expect, especially those that are the most extreme?

- In matters of humanitarian world diplomacy, what are the ICRC's priorities? What are the challenges for the next International Red Cross Conference?

- What are the financial challenges?

Part II. Meeting with Department Directors   1:45 p.m. – 4:45 p.m.
- Exchanges with **Charlotte Lindsey**, Director in charge of digital transformation - 1:45 p.m.- 2:45 p.m.

Follow-up of discussions and an in-depth look at the ICRC's activities in this area and the main challenges being faced.

- Exchanges avec **Sarah Epprecht**, Deputy Director of variable humanitarian reliefs operations and ICRC's responses - 2:45 p.m.- 3:45 p.m.

It is suggested that the exchanges be centered on two areas: protection and relief.

- Relief: how can the ICRC adapt itself to the development of needs (health, economic security, housing)? What are some concrete examples of innovative practices?
- Protection (detention, protection of civilians, family ties, missing persons): is the ICRC still involved in protection? To what extent are other humanitarian organizations aware of the standards of protection?

- Exchanges with **Maria Thestrup**, Head of the compliance group setting up the ICRC compliance office. - 3:45 p.m. - 4:45 p.m.
    - Presentation of the office and of its scope (sexual abuse, questions on transmission of information and transparency of findings: fraud, corruption, etc.).
    - What brought about the creation of this Compliance office? How did you set it up? What were the challenges?